

URBAN SHIELD TASK FORCE REPORT

FEBRUARY 21, 2018

ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Chaired by: Muntu Davis

Facilitated by: Frank J. Omowale Satterwhite
and Kathleen Harris



The seventh meeting on September 22 was devoted to review and approval of the findings and recommendations for learning question 4. The USTF, by majority vote, decided to suspend discussion of learning question 5 and to not make any recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding this matter.

QUESTION #1 Does the Urban Shield Project meet federal guidelines set out in the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grant?

ACCOUNTABILITY & TRANSPARENCY Q1 DISCUSSION SUMMARY

The USTF concluded that Urban Shield meets the federal guidelines set out in the UASI grant. Evidence shows that Urban Shield training receives approval from the Bay Area UASI Approval Authority, which uses the criteria for regional funding proposals. Urban Shield also meets federal Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) guidelines, which require the development of exercise plans, exercise evaluator handbooks, Master Scenario Events Lists (MELS), Team Binders, Exercise Evaluation Guides and After-Action Reports (AARs). Additionally, the Bay Area UASI funds⁴ have been spent in accordance to the federal guidelines that govern the UASI grant as specified in the Homeland Security Act of 2002.

Q1 RECOMMENDATIONS

I. ACCOUNTABILITY & TRANSPARENCY

- A. Require and ensure execution of the following Principles and Guidelines established and outlined in the Sheriff's January 6, 2017, Board Letter for the Fiscal Year 2016 Urban Area Security Initiative Agreement. Before each UASI funding request, require reporting on adherence to these principles and guidelines.
 - Expand community involvement and awareness
 - Urban Shield will be free from racist stereotyping
 - Work to expand training the medical profession for critical incidents
 - Urban Shield will not include surveillance training
 - Continue to examine new technology and equipment
 - Urban Shield will not include crowd control training
 - Continue to evaluate existing equipment
 - Urban Shield will exclude any and all vendors who display derogatory or racist messages in any form
 - Urban Shield will exclude the sale or transfer of any assault weapons and firearms
 - Will exclude vendors displaying non-law enforcement related tactical uniforms and equipment
 - Urban Shield will strive to maintain the finest first responder training possible

⁴ Bay Area Urban Area Security Initiative Project Proposal Guidance for Fiscal Year 2017 - August 2016, <http://www.bayareauasi.org/sites/default/files/resources/FY2017%20Project%20Proposal%20Guidance%20-%20Final.pdf>.

Recommendation 1A passed by majority vote.

- B. Ensure inclusion and execution of the following, "Urban Shield should disallow countries from participating in Urban Shield who have documented Human Rights abuses", which was previously approved by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors, in the above Principles and Guidelines.

Recommendation 1B passed by majority vote.

- C. The Sheriff's Office shall provide an annual report to the Board of Supervisors prior to the consideration of UASI funding for 2018 by the Board of Supervisors.

Recommendation 1C passed by majority vote.

- D. *Motion was made and seconded to add language to the draft recommendation:*

This recommendation was adopted by the Board on March 27, 2018, amended as shown here.

"The Sheriff shall report to the Alameda County Board of Supervisors on the implementation of the twelve (12) guidelines for Urban Shield approved by the Board in January 2017. Such report shall be public, and shall include, for each of the 12 guidelines: description of steps taken to implement the guideline; who was responsible for implementing the guideline; definitions used in implementation of the guidelines for key terms, including but not limited to: 'human rights', 'racists stereotyping', 'crowd control' and 'surveillance' and, for the guideline on international human rights violations, a list of all sources of information consulted and implementation of other Task Force recommendations that may be adopted by the Board."

Recommendation to add 1D failed by majority.

- E. The Sheriff's Office shall report to the Alameda County Board of Supervisors on the implementation of the twelve (12) guidelines for Urban Shield approved by the Board in January 2017 and implementation of other Task Force recommendations that may be adopted by the Board.

Recommendation 1E passed unanimously.**QUESTION #2 Is Urban Shield strictly an emergency preparedness program?****AN EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM Q2 DISCUSSION SUMMARY**

The USTF concluded that Urban Shield is strictly an emergency preparedness program, with room for improvement in implementing the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) "Whole Community" approach to emergency management through activities for a) preparedness, b) crisis response, c)

community and economic recovery. (See included footnotes and the final *Additional Info* section.)

Preparedness is defined by the national Department of Homeland Security (DHS)/Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as: ‘a continuous cycle of planning, organizing, training, equipping, exercising, evaluating and taking corrective action in an effort to ensure effective coordination during incident response’ and, a shared responsibility; it calls for the involvement of everyone – not just the government – in preparedness efforts. By working together, everyone can help keep the nation safe from harm and help keep it resilient when struck by hazards such as natural disasters, acts of terrorism and pandemics.’

Because the federal UASI grant program’s objective is to assist ‘high-threat, high-density Urban Areas in efforts to build, sustain, and deliver the capabilities necessary to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to and recover from acts of terrorism’ and 25% of the grant funding is to be used for law enforcement, Urban Shield activities have focused mainly on trainings and exercises for law enforcement but have expanded to include first responders and other emergency management personnel. It has also recently implemented the Grey (and Green) Command to include some activities for community preparedness.

The Urban Shield Task Force remains unclear on both the determination and application of the Threat Hazard Identifications and Risk Assessment (THIRA) in drafting exercise scenarios, prioritizing capability targets and gaps, and selecting capabilities to be tested and gaps to be addressed each year and over multiple years and, for this reason, did not make specific recommendations about these topics.

Some members expressed deep concerns that Bay Area UASI’s Risk Relevance Ratings show core capabilities such as ‘Health and Human Services’, ‘Economic and Community Recovery’, ‘Long-Term Vulnerability Reduction’, ‘Housing’, ‘Public Health and Medical Services’, and ‘Natural and Cultural Resources’, ALL as having low risk relevance, while ‘Cyber Security’, ‘On-Scene Security and Protection’, and ‘Screening, Search and Detection’ are rated as having the highest risk relevance.

Q2 RECOMMENDATIONS

II. WHOLE COMMUNITY APPROACH

- A. Develop and implement a plan for FEMA’s “Whole Community” approach, in Alameda County. Residents, emergency management practitioners, organizational and community leaders and government officials can collectively understand and assess the needs of the communities and determine the best ways to organize and strengthen their assets, capacities and interest to prepare for, respond to and recover from a natural disaster.

Recommendation 2A failed by majority vote.

- B. Include the “Whole Community” in planning and exercises, e.g., conduct tabletop exercises with the community in the 13 Bay Area UASI counties

leading up to a full-scale exercise in September. The example could be 4 tabletop exercises using the UASI Urban Area HUB (East Bay, West Bay, South Bay and North Bay).

Recommendation 2B passed by majority vote.

- C. Report on emergency preparedness activities in publicly available exercise documentation and/or summary reports, if not done already.

Recommendation 2C passed by majority vote.

- D. Train and exercise non-terrorism scenarios that can justifiably support terrorism preparedness, including prevention and recovery and be in alignment with FEMA's "Whole Community" approach to emergency management. (See *Additional Info* section below.)

Recommendation 2D passed by majority vote.

- E. *Motion was made and seconded to add language to the draft recommendation:*

"2e. Alameda County and multi-jurisdictional emergency preparedness shall dedicate as many or more resources and time to prevention of and recovery from critical emergencies than to respond to such emergencies."

Recommendation 2E failed by majority vote.

Question #3 In the event of an emergency/attack or natural disaster, will public safety
FUNDING agencies, public health and other emergency response departments, be adequately trained and equipped to respond to such disasters without the training offered by Urban Shield?

Q3 DISCUSSION SUMMARY

In relationship to public safety, public health and other emergency response departments that have been involved, interagency coordination between them has improved with Urban Shield.

No other significant sources of funding appear to be available for regional large-scale preparedness trainings and full-scale exercises.

Q3 RECOMMENDATIONS

III. FUNDING

- A. Identify and seek additional grant funding for local regional large full-scale training and exercises for community preparedness and response

training activities that is consistent with the Urban Shield Task Force recommendations.

Recommendation 3A passed by majority vote.

B. Motion was made and seconded to add to the draft recommendation:

“The funding source for multi-jurisdictional disaster preparedness exercises coordinated by Alameda County shall not require that the exercise have a ‘nexus to terrorism’.”

Recommendation 3B failed by majority vote.

C. Motion was made and seconded to add to the draft recommendation:

“The funding source for future multi-jurisdictional disaster preparedness exercises, outside of UASI, funding coordinated by Alameda County shall not require that the exercise have a ‘nexus to terrorism’.”

Recommendation 3C failed by majority vote.

D. Motion was made and seconded to add to the recommendation:

“The Board of Supervisors advocate to revise the priorities of federal emergency preparedness funding to remove the requirement of ‘a nexus to terrorism’.”

Recommendation 3D failed by majority vote.

E. Motion was made and seconded to add to the recommendation:

“The Board of Supervisors assess emergency preparedness funding and activities in relationship to the twelve (12) guidelines previously approved by the Board of Supervisors, applicable to Urban Shield.”

Recommendation 3E failed by majority vote.

A motion was made by Lara Kiswani, seconded by John Lindsay-Poland, to record in the minutes the way each task member voted.

Motion passed by majority vote.

Ayes: Lara Kiswani, John Lindsay-Poland, Tash Nguyen, Glenn Katon, Susan Abdallah, Anne Kronenberg, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman

Noes: Cheryl Miraglia, Marla Blagg, Mike Grant, Brett Keteles, Dave Winnacker

Question #4
TRAINING EXERCISES

Do the terms, conditions and guidelines of this program meet the demand for the Bay Area Region to be prepared to respond to natural disaster (fire, earthquake, etc.) or a terrorist act?

Q4 DISCUSSION SUMMARY

The USTF was unable to come to agreement on this question in relationship to Urban Shield. It remains unclear 1) how the assessment of the risk relevance, level of capability, and gap level is determined, and 2) how the Regional Threat Hazard Identifications and Risk Assessment (THIRA) is applied when selecting and drafting exercise scenarios, prioritizing capability targets and gaps, and selecting capabilities to be tested and gaps to be addressed each year and over multiple years.

Bay Area UASI's Risk Relevance ratings show core capabilities such as "Health and Human Services," "Economic and Community Recovery," "Long-Term Vulnerability Reduction," "Housing," "Public Health and Medical Services," and "Natural and Cultural Resources" ALL as having low risk relevance, while "Cyber Security," "On-Scene Security and Protection," and "Screening, Search and Detection" are rated as having the highest risk relevance.⁵

The USTF was in agreement that more could be done to meet the demand for whole community preparedness. Urban Shield has included a component for community preparedness. This component is separate from the full-scale exercise activities with first responders and emergency management personnel.

Motion was made by Marla Blagg and seconded to accept the above draft response.

Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Q4 RECOMMENDATIONS:

IV. TRAINING & EXERCISES

- A. Training and exercises should also focus emergency preparedness efforts on prevention of and recovery from emergencies in addition to response to such emergencies.**

Cheryl Miraglia made a motion, seconded by Marla Blagg, to accept recommendation 4a as amended above.

Recommendation 4A passed by majority vote.

Ayes: Cheryl Miraglia, Marla Blagg, Tash Nguyen, John Lindsay-Poland, Dave Winnacker, Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg, Brett Keteles, Mike Grant, Susan Abdallah

Noes: n/a

Abstain: Lara Kiswani, Glenn Katon

⁵ See Items 7 and 8 in July 2017 Bay Area UASI Approval Authority Meeting Master, at <http://bauasi.org/sites/default/files/resources/071317%20Approval%20Authority%20July%20Meeting%20Master.pdf>.

- B. Incorporate, where applicable, risks to people especially those who are vulnerable to harm in emergencies in Alameda County.

Recommendation 4B passed by majority vote.

Ayes: Marla Blagg, Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Mike Grant, Brett Keteles, Anne Kronenberg, Dave Winnacker

Noes: n/a

Abstain: Cheryl Miraglia, Lara Kiswani, Susan Abdallah, Tash Nguyen, John Lindsay-Poland, Glenn Katon

- C. Increase funding for the Urban Shield exercise to incorporate additional preparedness activities to support FEMA's "whole community" inclusion approach. By doing so, the County will be better prepared and more resilient to emergencies.

Recommendation 4C passed by majority vote.

Ayes: Marla Blagg, Anne Kronenberg, Cheryl Miraglia, Dan Bellino, Dave Winnacker, Brett Keteles, Mike Grant, Jim Betts, Travis Kusman, Dave Winnacker, Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg, Brett Keteles, Mike Grant

Noes: John Lindsay-Poland, Tash Nguyen, Susan Abdallah, Glenn Katon

- D. Motion was made by John Lindsay-Poland, seconded by Tash Nguyen, to add to the following recommendation for Q4.

Proposal for study: The Obama and Trump administrations sought steep cuts in UASI grant funds for FY 2017 and FY 2018, respectively. The Trump administration has stated that it will cut federal funds to sanctuary jurisdictions, which may include several within BAUSI area. The Alameda County Board of Supervisors shall send a request to jurisdictions within the BAUSI 12-county area to identify non-UASI grants and/or funds from their own resources for disaster preparedness, in order to replace dependence on UASI funds. In addition, the Board will survey the below-named jurisdictions that have not participated in Urban Shield for a number of years, requesting the following information:

- a) Why have you not participated in Urban Shield? What has the effect been, if any?
- b) What programs have been implemented to address preparedness for critical emergencies?
- c) How have community-based programs responded or grown since the city stopped participating in Urban Shield?

- d) Who participates in them (name departments)? Do community members or civilians participate?
- e) What are the contents of the trainings, and who runs them?
- f) What do these trainings emphasize? (Ex. natural disaster, mass casualty, terrorist attack, etc.)
- g) What are the stated objectives of these trainings?
- h) How do these trainings facilitate relationships between emergency workers and the community?
- i) What is the number of professional development days?
- j) Do you receive training in projects for recovery from critical emergencies?
- k) How do you meet your budget for these trainings? Through city or county?
- l) What is the general procedure for responding to mass casualty events? (Who responds)
- m) (For emergency services) Do you have trainings or events coming up that are open to the public?

The Alameda County Sheriff's Office shall verify which law enforcement tactical teams of the following jurisdictions did not participate in Urban Shield for three or more of the last ten years or did not apply to participate in 2016: Menlo Park PD; Palo Alto PD; Mountain View PD; Santa Clara County Sheriff; Vallejo PD; Santa Cruz PD; Watsonville PD; Pacifica PD; Napa County city PDs; Sonoma County city PDs; Marin County city PDs; except Novato.

Motion passed by majority.

Ayes: Susan Abdallah, Lara Kiswani, Tash Nguyen, John Lindsay-Poland, Glenn Katon, Dave Winnacker, Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg, Brett Keteles, Marla Blagg

Noes: Cheryl Miraglia, Mike Grant

- E. **Motion was made by John Lindsay-Poland and seconded by Tash Nguyen to add to the following recommendation for Q4.**

Risk Relevance ratings should prioritize risks to people in the Bay Area, especially those who are vulnerable to harm in emergencies, not to non-human assets.

Motion passed by majority.

Ayes: John Lindsay-Poland, Tash Nguyen, Lara Kiswani, Susan Abdallah, Glenn Katon, Dave Winnacker, Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg, Brett Keteles, Mike Grant

Noes: n/a

Abstain: Cheryl Miraglia, Marla Blagg

QUESTION #5
IMPACT ON THE
COMMUNITY

What is the impact of Urban Shield on the community's relationship with law enforcement and other emergency preparedness responders such as the public health department; health care agencies; public education agencies; public transportation agencies; fire departments; and emergency medical services?

A motion was made by Lara Kiswani, seconded by John Lindsay-Poland, to suspend discussion on Question 5 and to not vote on the draft response or draft recommendations, given that the Urban Shield Task Force does not represent vulnerable communities or those most impacted by it and that this is not the right body to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors about community impact of Urban Shield.

It was suggested that because the composition of the USTF was disproportionately not representative of vulnerable communities and the community most impacted by policing in Alameda County and because of a stated concern for potential conflicts of interest with some USTF members, the USTF could not legitimately answer this question.

It was also suggested that being a participant in Urban Shield exercises (i.e. Sheriff's Office, participating police and fire departments, etc.) equated to having a "material or financial interest" in Urban Shield. Therefore, participants with such a "material interest" were incapable of making an impartial judgement of Urban Shield's impacts on community-law enforcement relations.

Others suggested that being a participant in the Urban Shield exercises did not equate to having a "material interest". Comments included that the funding from Urban Shield to participant organizations is a pass through to pay for consumables and the other things that make the exercise possible; it is not "payment" for participation. It was also suggested that being a participant did not mean that you were incapable of making an impartial observation or of providing input or participating in the discussion about what Urban Shield should look like going forward.

Others expressed a desire for the USTF to, at a minimum, discuss the draft recommendations under Q5 if we did not answer the proposed learning question.

After additional discussion by the Task Force members, followed by 28 public comments and a song by public participants in opposition to Urban Shield and about the negative impacts on vulnerable communities, **the motion passed by majority vote to suspend discussion of learning question 5 and to not make any recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding this question.**

Ayes: Lara Kisawani, John Lindsay-Poland, Tash Nguyen, Susan Abdallah, Glenn Katon, Dave Winnacker, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg

Noes: Cheryl Miraglia, Marla Blagg, Mike Grant

Abstain: Dan Bellino, Brett Keteles, Jim Betts

SUMMARY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS: John Lindsay-Poland made a motion, which was seconded, that the report to the Board of Supervisors include a summary of substantive points made in the last two meetings of Task Force.

Motion failed by majority vote.

Ayes: N/A

Noes: Cheryl Miraglia Glenn Katon, Dave Winnacker, Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg, Brett Keteles, Marla Blagg

Abstain: Susan Abdallah, Lara Kiswani, Tash Nguyen, John Lindsay-Poland

CONCLUSION: The USTF appreciates the opportunity to represent Alameda County's 5 districts, to assist the Board of Supervisors in gaining a more comprehensive understanding of Urban Shield, our first responders' capabilities, and to shed light on the needs and impacts in communities served by the Urban Shield. It is our hope that our efforts will assist the Board of Supervisors to improve preparedness for large scale emergencies while safeguarding the rights of every resident in Alameda County.

ADDITIONAL TASK FORCE MATERIALS Draft Responses and Recommendations
Master List of Recommendations
Minutes
USTF Webpage with Research & Data submitted for consideration by the USTF

ADDITIONAL INFO

(Provided to clarify the term “‘Whole Community’ approach” referenced in a few of the recommendations submitted for consideration by Task Force members during the discussion.)

Excerpts from FEMA’s *A Whole Community Approach to Emergency Management: Principles, Themes, and Pathways for Action*: “As a concept, Whole Community is a means by which residents, emergency management practitioners, organizational and community leaders, and government officials can collectively understand and assess the needs of their respective communities and determine the best ways to organize and strengthen their assets, capacities, and interests. By doing so, a more effective path to societal security and resilience is built. In a sense, Whole Community is a philosophical approach on how to think about conducting emergency management.

Benefits include:

- Shared understanding of community needs and capabilities
- Greater empowerment and integration of resources from across the community
- Stronger social infrastructure
- Establishment of relationships that facilitate more effective prevention, protection, mitigation, response, and recovery activities
- Increased individual and collective preparedness
- Greater resiliency at both the community and national levels

...

Whole Community Principles and Strategic Themes

Numerous factors contribute to the resilience of communities and effective emergency management outcomes. However, three principles that represent the foundation for establishing a Whole Community approach to emergency management emerged during the national dialogue.

Whole Community Principles:

- **Understand and meet the actual needs of the whole community.** Community engagement can lead to a deeper understanding of the unique and diverse needs of a population, including its demographics, values, norms, community structures, networks, and relationships. The more we know about our communities, the better we can understand their real-life safety and sustaining needs and their motivations to participate in emergency management-related activities prior to an event.
- **Engage and empower all parts of the community.** Engaging the whole community and empowering local action will better position stakeholders to plan for and meet the actual needs of a community and strengthen the local capacity to deal with the consequences of all threats and hazards. This requires all members of the community to be part of the emergency management team, which should include diverse community members, social and community service groups and institutions, faith-based and disability groups, academia, professional associations, and the private and nonprofit sectors, while including government agencies who may not traditionally have been directly involved in emergency management. When the community is engaged in an authentic dialogue, it becomes empowered to identify its needs and the existing resources that may be used to address them.
- **Strengthen what works well in communities on a daily basis.** A Whole Community approach to building community resilience requires finding ways to support and strengthen the institutions,

assets, and networks that already work well in communities and are working to address issues that are important to community members on a daily basis. Existing structures and relationships that are present in the daily lives of individuals, families, businesses, and organizations before an incident occurs can be leveraged and empowered to act effectively during and after a disaster strikes.

In addition to the three Whole Community principles, six strategic themes were identified through research, discussions, and examples provided by emergency management practitioners. These themes speak to the ways the Whole Community approach can be effectively employed in emergency management and, as such, represent pathways for action to implement the principles.

Whole Community Strategic Themes:

- Understand community complexity.
- Recognize community capabilities and needs.
- Foster relationships with community leaders.
- Build and maintain partnerships.
- Empower local action.
- Leverage and strengthen social infrastructure, networks, and assets.”